

**RULES AND REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO THE ARKANSAS PRESCRIPTION
DRUG MONITORING PROGRAM
WRITTEN FINDINGS OF FINANCIAL IMPACT
IN ACCORDANCE WITH ARK. CODE ANN. § 25-15-204(e)**

- 1) A statement of the Rule's basis and purpose:

The amendments that have a financial impact are made to comply with Act 901 of 2015 which requires changes to the PDMP computer program.

- 2) The problem the agency seeks to address with the proposed rule, including a statement of whether the rule is required by statute:

The purpose of the amendments includes creating access, accountability, verification, and reporting components for certified law enforcement prescription drug diversion investigators who have been properly trained and certified in accordance with the Act. All of these amendments are required by Act 901 of 2015.

- 3) A description of the factual evidence that (a) justifies the agency's need for the proposed rule; and (b) describes how the benefits of the rule meet the relevant statutory objectives and justify the rule's cost:

The current PDMP computer program does not support access for certified law enforcement prescription drug diversion investigators. Access for these investigators will not require a search warrant. This is anticipated to shorten the time needed for the investigative process. The cost to develop this new access is a onetime development fee.

- 4) A list of less costly alternatives to the proposed rule and the reason why the alternatives do not adequately address the problem to be solved by the proposed rule:

There are no less costly alternatives to this Rule.

- 5) A list of alternatives to the proposed rule that were suggested as a result of public comment and the reasons why the alternatives do not adequately address the problem to be solved by the proposed rule:

At this time, there have been no less costly alternatives proposed.

- 6) A statement of whether existing rules have created or contributed to the problem the agency seeks to address with the proposed rule and, if existing rules have created or contributed to the problem, an explanation of why amendment or repeal of the rule creating or contributing to the problem is not a sufficient response; and

N/A

- 7) An agency plan for review of the rule no less than every ten (10) years to determine whether, based upon evidence, there remains a need for the rule, including, without limitation, whether (a) the rule is achieving the statutory objectives; (b) the benefits of the rule continue to justify its costs; and (c) the rule can be amended or repealed to reduce costs while continuing to achieve the statutory objectives.

There are built in reviews of grant funding to ensure that the monies are being spent in accordance with the grant requirements. However, since this is a onetime cost, there is no need to set up a review outside of the standard grant review.